REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on December 28, 2007, and the references cited therewith..

Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 18, and 22 are amended, claims 16 and 19 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-15, 17-18, and 20-26 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 7-10 were objected to because of informalities. Applicant has addressed each of the Examiner's objections and has amended claim 7 to more clearly recite the subject matter contained therein.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the objection to claim 7, as well as to claims 8-10 which depend therefrom.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 11-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,753). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

In the interest of furthering prosecution of the current application, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 11, 18, and 22 to include subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed December 28, 2007 and in the previous Office Action mailed August 1, 2007. Specifically, Applicant has incorporated subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner with respect to currently canceled claims 16 and 19 into independent claims 1, 7, 11, 18, and 22.

The Alexander reference appears to teach an emulated local area network (ELAN) that includes a primary and a backup default gateway that each are configured with a default gateway IP address and associated MAC address. Initially, the primary gateway registers the default gateway MAC address. While the primary default gateway is active, the backup default gateway continually attempts to register the default MAC address, and when the primary default gateway fails, the backup

Rev. 01/08

default gateway is then allowed to register the default gateway MAC address. (Abstract)

At page 19 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 16 and 19 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant has canceled claim 16 and has incorporated into independent base claim 11 each element contained in now canceled claim 16. Applicant has also canceled claim 19 and has incorporated into independent base claim 18 each element contained in now canceled claim 19.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits Alexander does not contain all elements in independent claims 11 and 18, as amended. For example, Applicant is unable to locate anywhere in the Alexander reference, a teaching or suggestion of, among other things, "a method of setting up router redundancy between a first and a second physical router" that includes:

> designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the first physical router;
> designating a domain of the first physical router;
> assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;
> setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;
> executing program instructions to communicate, between the first physical router and the second physical router, address information assigned to the second physical router; and
> designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 11, as amended.

Applicant is also unable to locate anywhere in the Alexander reference, a teaching or suggestion of, among other things, "a method of setting up router redundancy between a first and a second physical router" that includes:

> assigning an IP address to the first physical router
> designating a domain of the first physical router;
> assigning an IP address to the second physical router;
> designating a domain of the second physical router;
> assigning a router identifier to the second physical router;

Rev. 01/08

setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;

auto-configuring address information for a virtual router on the second physical router based on the IP address and domain of the first physical router by executing program instructions to communicate between the first and second physical routers; and

auto-configuring address information for a virtual router on the first physical router based on the IP address and domain of the second physical router by executing program instructions to communicate between the first and second physical routers

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 18, as amended.

Based on the forgoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Alexander does not support a proper § 102(b) rejection of claims 11 and 18, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection for independent claims 11 and 18, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 22-26 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,753) in view of Datta (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,341). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

In the interest of furthering prosecution of the current application, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 22 to include subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed December 28, 2007 and in the previous Office Action mailed August 1, 2007. Specifically, Applicant has incorporated subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner with respect to currently amended claim 11 and now canceled claim 16 into independent claims 1, 7, and 22.

At page 19 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that claim 16 "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 7, and 22 to incorporate each element now contained in currently amended claim 11, which is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above.

Rev. 01/08

As such, Applicant respectfully submits Alexander does not contain all elements in independent claims 1, 7, and 22, as amended. For example, Applicant is unable to locate anywhere in the Alexander reference, a teaching or suggestion of, among other things, a memory device having program instructions executable to:

communicate, between a first physical router and a second physical router, address information assigned to the first physical router and address information assigned to the second physical router;

designate a domain of the first physical router;

assign a router identifier to the first physical router;

set up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;

designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router; and

designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended.

Applicant is also unable to locate anywhere in the Alexander reference, a teaching or suggestion of, among other things, a network management system having a first and a second physical router wherein:

the second physical router includes:

means for obtaining address information from the first physical router and communicating the address information to the second physical router;

means for designating a domain of the first physical router;

means for assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;

means for setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router; and

means for designating a fail-over virtual router interface on the second physical router based on the address information obtained from the first physical router; and

the first physical router includes means for designating a fail-over virtual router interface on the first physical router based on the address information obtained from the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 7, as amended.

Applicant is also unable to locate anywhere in the Alexander reference, a teaching or suggestion of, among other things, a computer readable medium having a program to cause a device to perform a method that includes:

> designating a domain of the first physical router;
> assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;
> setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;
> executing program instructions to communicate, between the first physical router and the second physical router, address information assigned to the second physical router;
> designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the first physical router; and
> designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 22, as amended.

From Applicant's review of the Datta reference, Datta does not cure the deficiencies of Alexander. For instance, Datta does not teach or suggest a memory device having program instructions executable to:

> communicate, between a first physical router and a second physical router, address information assigned to the first physical router and address information assigned to the second physical router;
> designate a domain of the first physical router;
> assign a router identifier to the first physical router;
> set up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;
> designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router; and
> designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended.

Also, Datta does not teach or suggest a network management system having a first and a second physical router wherein:

> the second physical router includes:
> > means for obtaining address information from the first physical router and communicating the address information to the second physical router;

Rev. 01/08

   means for designating a domain of the first physical router;

   means for assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;

   means for setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router; and

   means for designating a fail-over virtual router interface on the second physical router based on the address information obtained from the first physical router; and

   the first physical router includes means for designating a fail-over virtual router interface on the first physical router based on the address information obtained from the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 7, as amended.

Also, Datta does not teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program to cause a device to perform a method that includes:

   designating a domain of the first physical router;

   assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;

   setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;

   executing program instructions to communicate, between the first physical router and the second physical router, address information assigned to the second physical router;

   designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the first physical router; and

   designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 22, as amended.

Therefore, the Alexander and Datta references, independently or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 22, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 1, 7, and 22, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,753) in view of Datta (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,341) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 5,313,465).

For the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the Alexander reference does not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claim 1. From Applicant's review of the Datta reference and the Perlman reference, the references fail to cure the deficiencies of the Alexander reference.

For instance, neither Datta nor Perlman teach or suggest a memory device having program instructions executable to:

> communicate, between a first physical router and a second physical router, address information assigned to the first physical router and address information assigned to the second physical router;
> designate a domain of the first physical router;
> assign a router identifier to the first physical router;
> set up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;
> designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router; and
> designate a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, the Alexander, Datta, and Perlman references, independently or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 6, which depends from independent claim 1.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,753) in view of Kanekar (U.S. Patent No. 7,006,431).

For the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the Alexander reference does not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claim 11, as amended. From Applicant's review of the Kanekar reference, the reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Alexander reference.

For instance, Kanekar does not teach or suggest "a method of setting up router redundancy between a first and a second physical router" that includes:

designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the first physical router;

designating a domain of the first physical router;

assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;

setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;

executing program instructions to communicate, between the first physical router and the second physical router, address information assigned to the second physical router; and

designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 11, as amended.

Accordingly, the Alexander and Kanekar references, independently or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claim 11, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 14, which depends from independent claim 11.

Claims 15, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,753) in view of Singh (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0177762).

For the reasons stated above, the Applicant submits that the Alexander reference does not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's independent claims 11 and 18. From Applicant's review of the Singh reference, the reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Alexander reference.

For instance, Singh does not teach or suggest "a method of setting up router redundancy between a first and a second physical router" that includes:

designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the first physical router on the second physical router based on the address information assigned to the first physical router;

designating a domain of the first physical router;

assigning a router identifier to the first physical router;

setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;

executing program instructions to communicate, between the first physical router and the second physical router, address information assigned to the second physical router; and

designating a fail-over virtual router interface for the second physical
router on the first physical router based on the address information assigned
to the second physical router

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 11, as amended.

Also, Singh does not teach or suggest "a method of setting up router
redundancy between a first and a second physical router" that includes:

assigning an IP address to the first physical router
designating a domain of the first physical router;
assigning an IP address to the second physical router;
designating a domain of the second physical router;
assigning a router identifier to the second physical router;
setting up a virtual router interface on the first physical router;
auto-configuring address information for a virtual router on the
second physical router based on the IP address and domain of the first
physical router by executing program instructions to communicate between
the first and second physical routers; and
auto-configuring address information for a virtual router on the first
physical router based on the IP address and domain of the second physical
router by executing program instructions to communicate between the first
and second physical routers

as provided in Applicant's independent claim 18, as amended.

Accordingly, the Alexander and Singh references, independently or in
combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element in Applicant's
independent claims 11 and 18, as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully
requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 15, which
depends from independent claim 11, as well as of claims 20 and 21, which depend
from independent claim 18.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16 and 17 were objected to as set forth in paragraph 2 as being
dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten
in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any
intervening claims.

Claim 19 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but
was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the
limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application No. 10/765,655
Amendment dated February 28, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 28, 2007

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Rev. 01/08

Page 18 of 19

Application No. 10/765,655
Amendment dated February 28, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 28, 2007

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Jeffery L. Cameron at (612) 236-0121.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being transmitted to United States Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300 , on this 2X day of February , 2008.

Name Aaron Morris

Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Heather N. Rorie

By Applicant's Representatives,
Brooks, Cameron & Huebsch, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: _____
    Jeffery L. Cameron
    Reg. No. 43,527

Date: 2/28/08

Rev. 01/08

Page 19 of 19

PAGE 21/21 * RCVD AT 2/28/2008 6:43:49 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/9 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:6126599344 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-02